

Pam: 39: (*41) PON

MONTEAL INSTITUTE
LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF CANADIAN PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS
AS POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDING

FOR PROJECTS BY OR ABOUT NATIVE PEOPLE:

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|----|
| I. Background and | A SUMMARY REPORT | 1 |
| II. A Terminological Note | | 2 |
| III. Methodology of the Study | | 3 |
| IV. Background on Foundations | | 4 |
| V. The Nature of Donations | | 5 |
| VI. Examples of Projects | Prepared by | 6 |
| VII. The Application for a Grant | J. Rick Ponting, Ph.D. 412 Ranchview Place, N.W. Calgary, Alberta T3G 1A8 | 9 |
| VIII. Conclusions | | 14 |

for

APPENDICES

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| A. Financial Policy, Research and Evaluation with Donations | Indian and Inuit Affairs Program Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Ottawa, Ontario | 17 |
| B. Selected Statistics of Individual Foundations in the Sample | K1A 0H4 | 18 |

July 1979

1 1979

Catie Cooke

37000


POLAR
PAM
1235

POLARPAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOREAL INSTITUTE
LIBRARY

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Background and Purposes of the Study | 1 |
| II. A Terminological Note | 2 |
| III. Methodology of the Study | 2 |
| IV. Background on Foundations | 3 |
| V. The Extent of Donations | 6 |
| VI. Examples of Projects Supported | 8 |
| VII. The Application for a Grant | 9 |
| VIII. Concluding Observations | 14 |
| APPENDICES | |
| A. Financial Profile of Foundations in Sample with Donations in Most Recently Available Years | 17 |
| B. Selected Characteristics of Individual Foundations in the Sample | 18 |



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

I. Background and Purposes of the Study

Grants from philanthropic foundations can be very useful to organizations in a variety of ways, two of the more important of which are that they can increase the autonomy of the organization from government and they can be used to fund projects or programs which are not appropriately funded by government. In the course of conducting other research the author was told by knowledgeable sources in the foundation sector that it appeared to them that Native people were making little use of foundations as a resource.

Thus, the author submitted a research proposal to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to conduct an exploratory study of the actual and potential funding role played by Canadian charitable foundations vis-à-vis the aboriginal peoples in Canada. The specific objectives were to ascertain which foundations are involved in making grants in this area and to what extent. The study was not intended to yield a fund-raising guide nor a directory of foundations. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of either the Department or the Foundations.

II. A Terminological Note

The term "Native Peoples field", which is used throughout this report, is a creation of the author and not of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. While its use is offensive to many status Indians, the blurring of the status-nonstatus distinction which it entails was found to be consonant with the world view of most foundation personnel. For a grant to be designated as falling within the "Native Peoples field", it has to meet one or more of the following criteria:

- (a) the recipient agency or organization has the word "Indian", "Native", "Metis", "Inuit", "Eskimo", "Aboriginal", or "Indigenous" in its official name;
- (b) aboriginal people constitute at least 50% of the clientele or membership of the recipient organization;
- (c) aboriginal people are explicitly cited in the grant application as beneficiaries of the grant; or
- (d) aboriginal people or their culture is the focus of the project for which the grant is given (e.g. a Native Studies program at a university).

Philanthropic foundations themselves are defined as: "non-governmental, non-profit organizations with funds and program managed by (their) own trustees or directors and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare".

III. Methodology of the Study

In light of the exploratory nature of the study and the impossibility of obtaining a random sample, a "snowball" sampling plan was used. Beginning with the Donner Canadian Foundation,

one of the most heavily involved in the Native Peoples field, an attempt was made to include in the sample those foundations which, by self-definition or reputation, were considered to have a major interest in the Native Peoples field. Several other large foundations which did not have a major interest in this field were also included so as to permit the researcher to address the question of the role which foundations could potentially play. The resultant sample consisted of nineteen (19) foundations. Site visits were made to eighteen of these and at that time structured, face-to-face interviews averaging two hours in duration were conducted with one or more senior knowledgeable informants there. Cooperation varied considerably, but on average was adequate or better.

IV. Background on Foundations

There are about one thousand foundations in Canada which meet the definition cited above. Almost half are located in Ontario and almost another one quarter are located in Quebec. An enormously wealthy sector of Canadian society, they constitute a marked contrast with Native peoples. The two largest foundations -- The J.W. McConnell Foundation and The W. Garfield Weston Foundation -- were reported to have combined assets of \$275 million in 1973. The Griffith Foundation has a further \$134 million in assets. Arlett reports the total assets of foundations to be in excess of one billion dollars, some of which is in the form of real estate. At least fifteen foundations dispense one million dollars or more per annum in donations, while the largest three probably each disbursed over six million dollars in 1977.

Foundations are of four types: family, corporate, community, and special interest. All but three of the foundations in the present sample are of the family type. These are founded by industrial barons or commercial and publishing entrepreneurs who have made their fortunes in Canada, and tend to include on their boards of directors a majority of persons who are either members of the family of the original benefactor, or his close friends and business associates. Community foundations, of which there are two in the sample, generally receive most of their funds in the form of bequests from wealthy individuals who have lived in that community. The sample contains one special interest foundation (The Law Foundation of British Columbia) but deliberately excluded corporate foundations. Despite the diversity among foundations which is suggested by this four-fold typology, all foundations share one characteristic, namely that if they are to avoid paying tax on their income they must adhere to certain regulations of the amended (1977) federal Income Tax Act. The most notable of these conditions are:

- (a) a tax penalty for foundations which do not show a reasonable rate of return on their investments, and
- (b) the stipulation that 90% of their annual income (not assets) must be disbursed.

Most foundations have a small staff which rarely exceeds five people; sometimes no staff members are employed on a full-time salaried basis. The relationship between the benefactor and the foundation is often far from an arm's length one and the result is that boards usually reflect an upper class bias.

While many foundations do not consistently follow a conservative ideology in their donating, the foundations included in the present study for the most part do deserve their conservative reputation. Among the less professionally oriented foundations, "old boy" networks are frequently activated in assessing an application or the need for the project which the application proposes.

Two different styles of philanthropy have been identified. These are the "professional" and the "traditional" and the differences between them can be of major significance to applicants. The professional approach to philanthropy is typified by the following characteristics:

- (a) selection by a professional staff or professional advisory committee, of specific fields of activity (and priorities within those fields) within which the foundation will donate money;
- (b) an attempt to maximize the constructive impact of the foundation's donations;
- (c) an attempt to build a range of important contacts within the specified areas, to develop its own expertise in those areas, and subsequently to become involved in a leadership capacity in actively shaping the field, rather than passively responding to the initiatives of applicants themselves;
- (d) the use of formal refereeing of applications by external evaluators;
- (e) a preference for innovative projects having policy implications or at least applicability elsewhere;

- (f) the giving of a small number of grants of a large size and the eschewal of small grants;
- (g) systematic attempts to monitor the results of their grants.

Traditional foundations tend to reflect the opposites of these characteristics. However, professionalism-traditionalism takes the form of a continuum. When an index of professionalism-traditionalism was constructed, it was found that two foundations in the sample are highly professional (Donner Canadian and Vancouver), eight are highly traditional (Atkinson, Bickell, Eaton, Koerner, Lee, McLean, Richardson, and Weston), and eight fall very near the mid-point of the continuum (Bronfman, R. Ivey, R. & J. Ivey, Laidlaw, Law Foundation of B.C., McConnell, Muttart, and Winnipeg). One (Molson) was unclassifiable. Lacking systematic data on the impact of the grants of the professional and traditional foundations, value judgements concerning the overall merit of each are probably best withheld.

V. The Extent of Donations

An attempt was made to compose a financial profile of each foundation in the sample, using annual reports, the T3010 Public Information Returns required by Revenue Canada, and in some cases internal records which foundations opened to the author. Where such data were unavailable, reliance had to be placed upon the estimates of knowledgeable informants within the foundation. Table 1 (Appendix 'A' of this report) presents these profiles.

Table 1 reveals that over the last few years two foundations -- Donner and Bronfman -- have consistently dominated philanthropic efforts in the Native Peoples field. Large grants in support of the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee's campaign to raise one and one half million dollars as operating funds for a five year

period have led to a conspicuous profile for two other foundations -- Molson and R. & J. Ivey -- in a particular reporting year, but they would not otherwise be considered among the dominants in the field. Several other foundations -- Lee, McLean, Nuttart, Richardson, and Vancouver -- are also quite "active" in the Native Peoples field, where "active" is defined as having made donations in this field in excess of \$25,000 during the designated reporting year.*

Clearly, those foundations which we have labelled as "dominant" or "active" collectively have the potential to make a significant impact upon the Native Peoples field. Their combined grants in this field for the designated reporting year exceed \$860,000 (excluding those of the Weston and McConnell Foundations). Inclusion of the grants of the Molson Foundation and the R. & J. Ivey Fund bring the total to over one and one-third million dollars. Given the existence of other large and moderate sized foundations both within and outside our sample, there undoubtedly exists the potential to increase this figure markedly, either through drawing more foundations into the "active category" by submitting more applications to them, or by lobbying foundations to declare the Native Peoples area as one of their main areas of funding involvement.

*Despite their respective profiles in Table 1, the author hesitates to classify the Weston Foundation as "dominant" or the McConnell Foundation as "active" due to a concern over the accuracy of the data provided by these two foundations. For both foundations the data on Native Peoples grants consist of estimates from a foundation official. It is not the intention of the author to suggest a deliberate attempt to mislead on the part of these officials. Rather, the caution shown here stems from the fact that neither respondent gave any indication that his estimate was anything more than a rough guess.

VI. Examples of Projects Supported

Since the work of foundations is not well understood outside of foundation circles, it is useful to illustrate some of the projects which they have funded in the Native Peoples field. These can be divided into four types. The first type consists of grants for the preservation of Indian culture. Examples here would include the seven grants (totalling \$629,000) made by the Donner Canadian Foundation for post-secondary projects in Native Studies and Education at six post-secondary institutions between 1970 and 1974, grants from the Bronfman Family Foundation in support of Indian cultural expression (e.g. music and drama festivals) and the many small grants (less than \$3,000) made by the Koerner Foundation and others to libraries, museums and art galleries for the acquisition or restoration of Indian materials.

A second type of grant involves those which, broadly speaking, enhance the sociological integration of a community. Examples here would include grants to enhance Native recreational facilities or programs, grants by the Laidlaw (\$5,000), Donner (\$15,000) and other foundations in support of Native communications facilities and a \$48,000 grant from the Donner Foundation to the University of Regina Faculty of Social Work for the Regina Native Race Relations Association.

A third type of grant consists of those related to defining and attaining what may broadly be termed 'political' goals. Examples here would include funds for pursuing land claims research and the various large grants (e.g. \$150,000 from the Molson Foundation and \$250,000 over five years from the R. & J. Ivey Fund) received by the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.

A final type of grant to be cited here consists of those grants which are designed to improve the health, security, or comfort of Native people. One example not taken from our sample would be the \$400,000 project funded by the Physicians' Services Incorporated Foundation for purposes of establishing a telecommunications system in Northwestern Ontario for diagnosing patients' illnesses at a distance. Other grants of this fourth type include a Bronfman Foundation grant for Native housing in the Canadian North, a Donner Foundation grant (\$11,000) for first aid courses in Native languages and a Lee Foundation grant (\$30,000) for job retraining for unemployed Natives in Edmonton.

VII. The Application for a Grant

Questions were also asked of respondents concerning their perceptions of the qualities of a good project proposal and the main problems or weaknesses of Native applications. Any advice which respondents had for Native applicants was also solicited. A list of responses to each of these three questions is given below. Also a detailed table (Appendix 'B') identifying specific characteristics of each foundation which would be of use to Native applicants is attached at the end of this report.

(i) What Do Foundation Directors Look For In A Project?

The following are features mentioned by respondents. They are not presented in any particular order and vary in importance from one foundation to another.

- (a) The quality of the leadership of the project (e.g. general reputation, commitment, responsibility, fiscal competence, management skills, "track record" of the organization).

- (b) Leverage: That is, can the Foundation's money be used to obtain matching funds from another source. Conversely, some foundations look very favourably upon applicants who have already raised some funds by their own efforts in the community.
- (c) Economic viability of the project upon cessation of the grant (long-range planning) or financial viability of the applicant organization.
- (d) Psychological and Career Impact: What will be the impact of the project upon those administering it? Is it too big for them? Will it have a disruptive influence upon the receiving organization's other activities due to its sheer size?
- (e) Grass roots impact; public benefit is maximized.
- (f) Realism.
- (g) Imagination or Innovation.
- (h) Feedback on the progress of any projects of the applicant which that Foundation has funded in the past.
- (i) Institutional commitment backing up the project (e.g. the project is a high priority of the organization seeking funds or has support of the community or of specific, responsible individuals).
- (j) Geographical breadth of impact.
- (k) Clearly demonstrated need, consistent with the amount of funding being sought; clearly specified objectives.
- (l) Appropriateness of the project as one to be funded by the private sector. That is, it should not be something that is more appropriately funded by government.

- (m) Application not a form letter.
- (n) Non-controversiality (in terms of federal or provincial politics).
- (o) "A strong indication that it is a self-help project, rather than being parachuted in by 'do-gooders' from somewhere else."
- (p) Continuity in the leadership of the project.
- (q) An evaluative component.

It is obviously important for an applicant to know which of the above criteria are eschewed and which are given priority by the particular foundation to which an application is being sent. While this is often very idiosyncratic and non-codified for any given foundation, it is also often the case that a foundation will distribute application guidelines upon request.

(ii) Main Problems or Weaknesses of Native Applications

Many respondents answered this question by noting that the main problems and weaknesses of Native applications are the same as those found in non-Native applications. Often they then proceeded to identify one or two shortcomings. The various answers to this question are listed below, again in no particular order.

- (a) "Form letter" applications that give little indication (other than an address) that the application has been prepared specifically for the particular foundation to which it is being sent. (Reference to the interests of the foundation or to its past support of a similar or related project can help overcome this shortcoming).

- (b) Insufficient information; lack of specificity or detail (a commonly cited weakness).
- (c) Overly slick proposals.¹⁰
- (d) Lack of provision for follow-up reporting, at recipient's initiative, on what has been done with the grant.
- (e) Lack of clarification of why salaried staff already hired under government core funding cannot do the job.
- (f) Lack of well thought out ideas (i.e. it is conceptually weak).
- (g) Lack of understanding of the purposes, interests, and capabilities of the foundation.
- (h) Overwhelming the foundation with documentation ("inundating us with a flood of paper").
- (i) Failure to identify clearly the specific benefits (in the community) which are expected to result from the project.
- (j) Lack of information on other support (sources and amounts already received for the same project).

¹⁰ Among a minority of foundations there is a concern that professional fund-raisers are intervening in the application process and perhaps exploiting Indian applicants in so doing. There is the possibility of a "Catch 22" situation arising here, whereby an application may be turned down or turned back due to insufficient information being provided in it, while a complete and well organized application may be viewed with suspicion as being the work of parasitic consultants. Foundation personnel need to be made aware of the constructive, non-exploitative role which The Canadian Association in Support of the Native People has played in producing its booklet entitled A Fund Raising Guide For Native Groups, the ideas of which are reflected in an increasing number of Native applications to foundations.

(iii) Respondents' Advice to Native Applicants

Some respondents declined to offer advice. The advice which was offered by others is reported below in the respondents' own words or a paraphrased form thereof.

- (a) Know the funding agency and follow its application rules and procedures.
- (b) Introduce the applicant organization, including its size, objectives, activities, source of funding, geographical location (if necessary), and "track record".
- (c) Come and see me in advance. Exude some of your optimism on me.
- (d) Any in-person contact with the foundation should be by a member of the Board of Directors of the applying organization, rather than by a paid Executive Director of the organization.
- (e) If a meeting is to be held with the foundation do not send a large delegation.
- (f) Avoid intermediaries, especially paid fund-raising consultants who make an application appear too "slick".
- (g) A straightforward, well-presented letter and a clear budget works wonders.
- (h) Show that the project does not duplicate the work of an existing organization. If it does duplicate the work of an existing organization, document your claims that you can do it better than that organization.
- (i) Be more specific.

- (j) Do not give up on the foundation if it seeks further clarification or information.
- (k) Don't be frightened to come and ask.
- (l) If you keep us informed, you will get funded the next time.
- (m) Native organizations have an obligation to educate foundations as to their contemporary needs.

VIII. Concluding Observations

The amount of financial support provided annually in the Native Peoples field by the foundations in our sample which we have labelled as "dominant" or "active" in the field is approximately one and one third million dollars. The annual injection of funds into this field by all Canadian private philanthropic foundations is estimated by the author to be at least one and three quarter million dollars and perhaps as much as two and one half million dollars. This is a significant amount of money, but as it amounts to less than one per cent of the budget of the Indian and Inuit Affairs Program of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, it is clearly not a substitute for government funding.

An analysis of the approximate number of applications received annually in the Native Peoples field, in relation to the total number of applications received across all fields by the foundations in the sample , reveals applications in the Native Peoples field to be "under-represented", considering the fact that Native people are over-represented in the so-called "under-privileged" sector of society. Similarly, in light of the fact

that all Canadian foundations taken together make donations worth perhaps 50 million dollars annually, and Native Peoples projects receive only about two and one half million dollars of this, we are led to conclude, as we had suspected at the outset, that foundations are under-utilized by Native people. The major reasons for this would seem to be:

- (a) Natives' low level of awareness of foundations (abetted by the secrecy of some foundations);
- (b) the reputation of foundations for conservatism and paternalism; and
- (c) the belief (accurate or not) apparently held by some Natives that funds can be more easily obtained elsewhere without their having to formulate rigorous proposals and account for the money afterwards.

(The current study found considerable variability among foundations in the rigour of their application, reporting and accountability procedures. Reporting and accountability requirements rarely, if ever, take on the proportions of an obstacle.)

However, perhaps one should only speak of "under-utilization" of foundations by Natives if Natives do in fact wish to make greater use of foundations. There appears to be a need for Native people to ask themselves whether they wish to utilize foundations more fully and if so, under what circumstances. If the answer to that question is affirmative, then other needs arise, including:

- (a) the need for Native people to explain themselves to foundations;
- (b) the need to develop an overall strategy as to the most appropriate uses of, and approaches to foundations;
- (c) the need for Native organizations to share data on foundations; and

- (d) the need to identify areas where there is a harmony of interests and/or the potential for on-going cooperation between foundations and Native organizations.

If the decision were made to utilize foundations more fully several areas of opportunity could be exploited. Included here would be:

- (a) the common concern of foundations and Native organizations for the "grass roots" person;
- (b) the interest of many foundations in innovative projects or programs;
- (c) the desire on the part of a small number of foundations for national Native organizations to play a role in coordinating, prioritizing, and endorsing Native applications received by those foundations;
- (d) the contacts which foundation members have in the Canadian economic, political, cultural and public service elites;
- (e) the non-financial expertise in Native affairs which exists among the staffs of certain foundations; and
- (f) the potential sensitivity of foundations to public pressure in light of the fiduciary nature of their relationship with the public in dispensing their funds for what the government intends will be the public benefit.

TABLE 1
FINANCIAL PROFILE OF FOUNDATIONS IN SAMPLE, WITH DONATIONS IN MOST RECENTLY AVAILABLE YEARS

| NAME OF FOUNDATION | BASE REPORTING YEAR | LOCATION | ASSETS (\$000,000) | TOTAL \$ CHARTER'S | | (B) AS % OF (A) | NATIVE PEOPLES GRANTS | | AVERAGE GRANT SIZE | | PERCENT OF ALL DONATED \$ IN PRIOR 2 YRS. ALLOCATED TO NATIVE PEOPLES AREA |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | ALL AREAS (A) | NATIVE PEOPLES AREA (B) | | # | AS % OF ALL GRANTS | ALL AREAS | NATIVE PEOPLES AREA | |
| Atkinson Charitable | 1977 | Toronto | \$18 | \$1,377,277 | \$14,920 | 1% | 3 | 2% | \$7,063 | \$4,973 | 2% |
| J. P. Bickell | 1977 | Toronto | 23 | 1,451,000 | 9,000 | 1% | 1 | n.a. | 7,169** | 9,000 | n.a. |
| S. & S. Brenfman Family | 1977 | Montreal | 18 | 1,354,600 | 244,000 e | 18% x | 20 | n.a. | 6,000 x | n.a. | n.a. |
| Donner Canadian | 1978 | Toronto | 40 | 1,607,162 | 377,762 | 24% | 5 | 26% | 84,587 | 75,552 | 31% |
| Eaton | 1976 | Toronto | 10 | 709,940 | 2,800 e+ | <1/2% | 5 + | 2% | 3,100 x | 560 + | n.a. |
| Richard Ivey | 1977 | London | 10 | 929,525 | 7,500 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 46,476 | 7,500 | n.a. |
| Richard & Jean Ivey Fund | 1977 | London | 9 | 1,146,220 | 357,500 | 31% | 3 | 13% | 49,836 | 119,167 | <1/2% |
| L. & T. Koerner | 1977 | Vancouver | 2 | 170,875 e | 11,800 | 7% | 7 | 5% | 1,247 | 1,686 | 5% |
| Laidlaw | 1977 | Toronto | 11 | 744,536 e | 9,250 e | 1% | 3 | 7% | 18,159 | 3,083 | 13% |
| Lav Foundation of B.C. | 1977 | Vancouver | 3 | 1,828,248 | 19,435 | 1% | 1 | 2% | 43,529 | 19,435 | <1/2% |
| Clifford E. Lee | 1978 | Edmonton | 3 | 403,486 | 57,500 | 14% | 6 | 11% | 7,336 | 9,583 | 16% |
| McConnell | 1977 | Montreal | 150 e | 7,254,350 | 25,000 e | <1/2% | 4 x | 4 | n.a. | 6,250 e | n.a. |
| J.W. McLean | 1977 | Toronto | 6 | 413,191 | 30,000 | 7% | 4 | 4 | 4,643 | 7,500 | 5% |
| Muttart | 1977 | Edmonton | n.a. | 455,851 | 45,000 e | 10% | 4 | 4 | 4,643 | 7,500 | 5% |
| Molson | 1978 | Montreal | 6 | 772,000 + | 150,000 | 20% e | 1 | n.a. | 42,889+ | 150,000 | <1/2% e |
| Mrs. James A. Richardson | 1978 | Winnipeg | 2 | 300,000 x | 30,000 x | 10% x | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 6% x |
| Vancouver | 1977 | Vancouver | 63 | 3,191,229 | 71,344 | 2% | 12 | 4% | 10,818 | 5,945 | 2% |
| W. Garfield Weston | 1977 | Toronto | 150 e | n.a. | 500,000 e | 10% | 50 x | n.a. | n.a. | 10,000 x | n.a. |
| Winnipeg | 1978 | Winnipeg | 15 | 1,011,332 e | 23,511 | 2% | 10 | 6% | 6,524 | 2,351 | 6% |

x denotes approximately (more precise than "estimated")

e denotes estimated

na denotes not available

+ denotes 1977 data

++ denotes one previous year only

* denotes excludes scholarships and bursaries

- denotes figures from a two year reporting period divided in half

** denotes inclusion of only those 109 grants listed as "education" or "general"

† in the two year reporting period 1975-77.

‡ The author accepts responsibility for the missing date from this foundation. It is known that in 1978 and 1979 this foundation made two large grants (\$50,000 and \$67,500, respectively) to fund a Native Counsellor for three years at each of two Lethbridge, Alberta post secondary education institutions.

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL FOUNDATIONS IN THE SAMPLE

APPENDIX 'B'

| | NAME OF FOUNDATION | MAILING ADDRESS | GEOGRAPHIC RESTRICTIONS TO GRANTS | INVOLVEMENT IN NATIVE PEOPLES FIELD |
|----|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Atkinson Charitable Foundation | One Yonge Street Toronto, Ont. M5E 1E5 | Ontario only | Minor |
| 2 | J.P. Bickell Foundation | c/o Personal Trust Div. National Trust Co. 21 King St. E., Toronto, Ont. | Ontario only | Minor |
| 3 | Samuel & Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation | 1916 Tupper Street Montreal, Que. H3H 1N5 | Canada | Dominant |
| 4 | Donner Canadian Foundation | P.O. Box 122, Tor. Dom. Ctr. Toronto, Ont. M5K 1H1 | Canada | Dominant |
| 5 | Eaton Foundation | One Dundas St. W., 20th Flr. Toronto, Ont. M5B 1C8 | Canada | Minor |
| 6 | Richard Ivey Foundation | 380 Wellington St., Ste. 1701 London, Ont. N6A 5C3 | Primarily Southwestern Ontario | Variable, potentially active |
| 7 | Richard & Jean Ivey Fund | 380 Wellington St., Ste. 2200 London, Ont. N6A 5B5 | Primarily Southwestern Ontario | Active |
| 8 | Leon & Thea Koerner Foundation | c/o The Permanent Box 10152, Pacific Ctr. N. Vancouver, B.C. V7Y 1E5 | Primarily B.C. and Yukon | Active |
| 9 | Laidlaw Foundation | 60 St. Clair Ave. E., Ste. 203 Toronto, Ont. M4T 1N5 | No | Minor |
| 10 | Law Foundation of British Columbia | 1199 W. Pender St., 9th Flr. Vancouver, B.C. V6E 2R1 | Primarily B.C. Must benefit B.C. | Minor |

| | FUNDS PRIMARILY BUILDINGS, EQUIPMENT | PRIMARILY INNOVATIVE OR POLICY ORIENTED | PREFERENCE CONCERNING ADVANCE CONSULTATION | NUMBER OF BOARD MEETINGS PER YEAR | WHAT LOOKS FOR IN A PROJECT (SEE PAGE 9 FOR CODE) | STAFF HAS AUTHORITY TO MAKE SMALL GRANTS | REPORTING & ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | No | No | No preference | 1/no. except July & August | a, e, f, g, m, p | No | No |
| 2 | No | No | No preference, recommends it | At least quarterly | a, k | No | No |
| 3 | No | No, but encourages innovation | Prefers not consult in advance | One | b(ii), c, e, g, h | Yes | Minor |
| 4 | No | Yes | Prefers advance consultation, in writing | Three | a, c, d, g, i, j, p, q | No | Yes, but not major |
| 5 | No | No. Instead cautious | Prefers advance consultation | Eleven | a, k, o | Yes | No |
| 6 | Yes, but not exclusively | No | Prefers advance consultation | Twelve | a, k, p | No | Minor |
| 7 | Yes, but not exclusively | No | No preference | Many | a, b(i), k | Yes | Yes |
| 8 | No | No | Prefers advance consultation | Three | c, f, k | No | Minor |
| 9 | No | Yes | Strong prefer- ence for no advance consultation | Five | g, i, j, k, l, q | Yes | Varies with size of grant |
| 10 | No | No | Prefers advance consultation | Six | a, e | No | Yes |

| | SOME AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST | OTHER COMMENTS | PUBLISHES REPORTS OR GUIDELINES |
|----|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Education (including Culture and Youth Development); Health Science; Social Welfare | Audited financial statement should accompany application. | Yes, annually |
| 2 | Medical Research; Education; General Charities | Avoids controversial projects. Half of donations are to Hospital for Sick Children. | Yes, biennially |
| 3 | Canadian North & Natives; Arts & Culture; Architectural Heritage; Children with learning problems. | Prefers matching grants. No films funded. Rapid response to grant requests. | Guidelines only |
| 4 | Native People; North; Law Reform & Penology; Future of Confederation; Canadian Foreign Policy. | Heavily involved in Native peoples area, with many contacts in field. Uses referees. | Yes, annually |
| 5 | Visual and performing arts, galleries and museums; youth | Over half of donations are to United Appeal. Major interest developing in performing and visual arts. Wary of slick applications. | Yes |
| 6 | Environment; Arts; Health | Emerging interests in sports and Inuit Art. | Yes, annually |
| 7 | Native People; Environment; Arts; Health | Prefers projects with wide impact ("bursting effect"). Looks carefully at calibre of leadership. Budgets carefully scrutinized. | Yes, annually |
| 8 | Native People; Cultural and creative arts; Education | Much interest in libraries and cultural preservation and restoration. | Yes, annually |
| 9 | Demonstration and development projects, Conservation and restoration, Arts | Wary of middlemen or slick applications. Grants promoting development and autonomy of a group are favoured. | Yes, biennially |
| 10 | Legal Aid; Law libraries; Legal education, legal research and law reform | Receptive to good applications from Native organizations. Budgets carefully scrutinized. Apply far enough in advance. | Yes, annually |

| | NAME OF FOUNDATION | MAILING ADDRESS | GEOGRAPHIC RESTRICTIONS TO GRANTS | INVOLVEMENT IN NATIVE PEOPLES FIELD |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 11 | Clifford E. Lee Foundation | 8819-143 Street Edmonton, Alta. T5R 0P1 | Primarily Edmonton and the Canadian North | Active |
| 12 | J.W. McConnell Foundation | 1130 Sherbrooke St. W., Ste. 510 Montreal, Que. H3A 2T1 | Particular emphasis upon Quebec | Minor |
| 13 | McLean Foundation | 95 St. Clair Ave. W., 15th Flr. Toronto, Ont. M4V 1P2 | Canada, social welfare grants in Ontario only | Active |
| 14 | Molson Foundation | C.P. 1600, Place d'Armes Montreal, Que. H2Y 3L3 | Canada | Variable, potentially active |
| 15 | Gladys & Merrill Muttart Foundation | 9939 Jasper Ave., Ste 330 Edmonton, Alta. T5J 2X4 | Canada | Active |
| 16 | Mrs. James A. Richardson Foundation | 1 Lombard Place Winnipeg, Man. R3B 0Y1 | Manitoba, Northwestern Ontario | Active |
| 17 | Vancouver Foundation | 1199 W. Pender St., 9th Flr. Vancouver, B.C. V6E 2R1 | B.C. (unless otherwise designated by donor) | Active |
| 18 | W. Garfield Weston Foundation | 22 St. Clair Ave. E., 19th Flr. Toronto, Ont. | Canada | Active |
| 19 | Winnipeg Foundation | 305 Broadway Ave., Ste. 800 Winnipeg, Man. R3C 0R9 | Winnipeg and area | Active |

| | FUNDS PRIMARILY BUILDINGS, EQUIPMENT | PRIMARILY INNOVATIVE OR POLICY ORIENTED | PREFERENCE CONCERNING ADVANCE CONSULTATION | NUMBER OF BOARD MEETINGS PER YEAR | WHAT LOOKS FOR IN A PROJECT (SEE PAGE 9 FOR CODE) | STAFF HAS AUTHORITY TO MAKE SMALL GRANTS | REPORTING & ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 11 | Yes, but not exclusively | No | Prefers advance consultation | Two | k | Yes | Usually not |
| 12 | Yes, but not exclusively | No | Request for advance consul- tation must be fwd. by letter | Ten | a, c, k, l (and, by inference of the researcher: e, n, o) | No | Yes |
| 13 | No | No | No preference | Four | k | Yes | No |
| 14 | No | Yes | Prefers not consult in advance | When req'd. (No set dead- line for appls.) | c, e, f, g | -- | -- |
| 15 | No | Yes | Prefers not consult in advance | Four or five | a, e | -- | Minor |
| 16 | No | No | Prefers advance consultation | Ten | a, o | No | No |
| 17 | No | No | Prefers advance consultation | Four | a, e | No | Yes |
| 18 | Yes | No | No preference | Eight | e | No | No |
| 19 | No | No | Prefers advance consultation | Eight | a, b, e, i | No | Minor |

| | SOME AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST | OTHER COMMENTS | PUBLISHES REPORTS OR GUIDELINES |
|----|---|--|---------------------------------|
| 11 | Day care centres and other social services; Native Peoples; Arts; Foreign Aid. Environmental preservation | Also funds Native bursaries. | Guidelines only |
| 12 | Very diverse interest which exclude anything related to communications media. | Extremely conservative and cautious in Native peoples area. Wary of slick applications. | Guidelines only |
| 13 | Native people; Conservation; Social Welfare; Arts | Member of board has authored book in Native peoples area and has many Native contacts. | Occasionally |
| 14 | Education: Health & Welfare; Social & National Development; Humanities | Prefers to donate "seed money" | No |
| 15 | Native People; Education; Medical Research | Becoming more actively involved in Native Peoples area. | No |
| 16 | Diverse interests, including Native Peoples | Favourable to neighbourhood projects in rundown and working class neighbourhoods. Favourable to youth and senior citizens projects. | No |
| 17 | Culture; Education; Child Welfare; Youth; Medical | Avoids political projects; prefers to be co-sponsor. Initial approach should be via brief letter. | Yes, annually |
| 18 | Small communities in Northern Canada; Youth; Geriatrics; Medical Research; Community projects | Non-political. Grass roots level benefits very important. Seldom funds education projects. Wary of slick proposals. | No |
| 19 | Very diverse. Major interest developing in Native employment. | Important that budget be realistic. Important that applicants have the job skills to carry out the proposed project. Proposal should look professional. Show how can do better job than existing agencies. | Yes, annually |

Date Due

| | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| DEC 7 '87 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Pam:39:(*41)
PON

ent of Canadian
s as potential sources
by or about native
to / prepared by J. Rick
ch, Policy, Research
nd Inuit Affairs
rtment of Indian and

AKN-1706

tudy to determine which
dations are involved in
ch by or about Canadian

#37000

f
S
2/8/87
377

37000

Pam: 39:(*41) PON

PONTING, J. Rick

A preliminary assessment of
Canadian philanthropic
foundations.....

#37000

Boreal Institute for Northern
Studies Library
CW 401 Bio Sci Bldg
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB Canada T6G 2E9

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 0329 0028